

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-10, 12-21, and 23-32, and 34-36 are pending in the application, claims 11, 22, and 33 having been previously canceled. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 are currently amended. Claims 35-36 have been added. The Amendment is supported in the Specification as-filed. Thus, this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 12-17, 23-28, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0042277 by Smith ("Smith") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,810 to Geiger *et al.* ("Geiger"). See Office Action at page 2. The Examiner has rejected claims 9-10 as allegedly unpatentable over Smith in view of Geiger and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,716,101 to Meadows *et al.* ("Meadows"). See Office Action at page 5. Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the reason that the references relied upon, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention.

In particular, the relied upon references do not teach or suggest at least the feature of "polling, by the web service, the mobile device to provide location data" as recited in claim 1, for example. (Emphasis added). Claims 12, 23, and 34 recite similar features. Instead, each of the relied upon references appear to describe mobile devices that transmit location data upon registration with a cell tower. See e.g., Smith at paragraph 0021, lines 2-4 ("HLR normally stores an MS's location area after the MS registers"); Geiger at col. 2, lines 18-21 ("mobile device 15 establishes communication from time to time with one or more of the base stations 11, 12, and 13. In doing so, the controller 20 establishes location information for the mobile device 15"); Meadows at col. 2, lines 34-39 ("A plurality of receivers are located across a geographical region for detecting location signals transmitted by wireless communications devices. A wireless network communicates location information detected by the receivers to a location

processor.”). Thus, none of the relied upon references teach or suggest at least the feature of “polling, by the web service, the mobile device to provide location data” as recited in claim 1, for example. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 are improper and must be withdrawn. Claims 2-10, 13-21, and 24-32 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34. As such, for at least the reasons set forth above, the rejection of these dependent claims are likewise improper and must be withdrawn.

New Claims 35-36

Applicant has added new claims 35-36. These new claims should be allowed for at least the reason that the relied upon references do not disclose, teach, or suggest every feature of these claims. For example, as set forth above, the relied upon references do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “polling, by the web service, the mobile device to provide location data,” which is also recited in claim 35. Furthermore, claim 35 recites “authorizing, at the web service, the client to access the location data based at least in part on the identified mobile device and the client.” (Emphasis added). However, the relied upon references appear to use different ways to authorize the client. See e.g., Smith at paragraph 0024, lines 12-15 (“the HLR accesses MS2’s subscriber profile and finds...that the calling MS1 is a telephone number that is authorized to receive location information”) (where the “HLR” of Smith is not a web service but rather a “Home Location Register”); Geiger at col. 4, lines 57-59 (“the location server 21 verifies the location access permission attribute certificate received via the requesting entity 25 from the mobile device 25”) (where “location server” of Geiger is not a web service); Meadows at col. 5, lines 38-40 (“the user enters an access code. The user may then be presented with a list of names of persons who the user is authorized to monitor.”) (where authorization appears to be based on the user alone and not the identified mobile device). Thus, for at least these reasons, the relied upon references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every feature of claim 35. Accordingly, claim 35 should be allowed. Claim 36 depends from and adds features to claim 35. As such, for at least the reasons set forth above, dependent claim 36 should likewise be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **February 19, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Hean L. Koo
Registration No. 61,214

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct Dial: 703-770-7939
Fax: 703-770-7901